

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Application of:	:
Bhupesh Gupta	:
	: Before the Examiner:
Serial No: 09/997,915	: Chau T. Nguyen
	:
Filed: 11/29/2001	: Group Art Unit: 2176
	:
Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD	: Confirmation No.: 6707
OF ORGANIZING BOOKMARKED	:
WEB PAGES INTO CATEGORIES	:

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.41

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a Reply to the Examiner's Answer dated August 09, 2007 in accordance with 37 CFR §41.41.

RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ARGUMENTS

The Examiner stated in the GROUNDS of REJECTION section of the Answer Brief that "Khan teaches *determining whether a web page to be bookmarked has been assigned a category on a server.*" Appellants respectfully disagree.

Khan teaches that a user may upload his/her bookmarks from a local computer system to a remote computer system. Once in the remote computer system, the bookmarks may be used to populate a Web (search) directory. In doing so, however, each bookmark is automatically or manually assigned into a category in the Web directory. While a bookmark is being added into a category in the Web directory, a search may be undertaken to determine whether the bookmark already exists in the Web directory. If so, the user will be so notified. After being notified, the user may continue adding the bookmark into the Web directory (see col. 11, line 40 to col. 12, line 27 of Khan).

Thus, Khan does not teach that a determination is made as to whether a Web page is assigned a category on a server when the Web page is being bookmarked. Rather, Khan teaches that when an already-bookmarked Web page is being added to a Web directory, a determination is made as to whether the bookmark already exists in the Web directory.

The Examiner further asserted in the GROUNDS of REJECTION section as well as in the RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT section of the Answer Brief that in Fig. 11 "Khan teaches *downloading the category if the Web page has been assigned a category.*" Again, Appellants respectfully disagree.

In Fig. 11, which is explained in col. 16, lines 28 – 35, Khan explains that a user may share his/her bookmarks with others by e-mailing the bookmarks to individuals or publishing the bookmarks on the Internet.

Firstly, mailing a bookmark to an individual only entails sending a link or a the URL of the Web page to an individual by e-mail. It does not entail sending the category to which the link is assigned by e-mail (see also col. 16, line 30).

AUS920010888US1

Secondly, publishing bookmarks on the Internet does not at all entail sending the bookmarks anywhere. It merely means that the bookmarks are made public. Therefore, categories to which bookmarks are associated are not downloaded anywhere.

Thirdly, *downloading the category if the Web page has been assigned a category* means that the category is downloaded if and only if it has been assigned to the Web page.

Thus, Khan does not teach anywhere in their disclosure the step of *downloading the category if the Web page has been assigned a category* as claimed.

In the RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT section, the Examiner asserted that in col. 12, lines 60 – 62, Khan teaches “*creating a sub-folder in the bookmark folder with the category as a name.*” Appellants continue to disagree with the Examiner.

In Col. 12, lines 60 – 62, Khan teaches that a sub-category may be created into which a site is categorized under one of the categories of the site directory.

Creating a sub-category under one of the categories of a site directory is not equivalent to creating a sub-folder that has the name of the category that was downloaded from a server in a bookmark folder. Thus, Appellants maintain that Khan does not teach the step of *creating a sub-folder in the bookmark folder with the category as a name.*

Finally, the Examiner asserted in col. 11, lines 54 – 61 that Khan teaches the step of *storing a bookmark to the Web page into the sub-folder*. However, Khan does not teach storing a bookmark to a Web page into a sub-folder that was created with the name of the category that was downloaded from a server.

Based on the foregoing, Appellants submit that Khan does not teach the invention as claimed and kindly request reversal of the rejection.

Appl. No. 09/997,915
Reply Brief dated 10/09/2007
Reply to Office Action of 08/09/2007

Respectfully Submitted

By: 

Volel Emile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,969
(512) 306-7969

AUS920010888US1